

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Aqua Connect, ) CV 11-05764 RSWL (MANx)  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. ) ORDER RE: DEFENDANT CODE  
Code Rebel, LLC; Arben ) REBEL, LLC'S MOTION FOR  
Kryeziu; Volodymyr Bykov; , ) LEAVE TO FILE  
and DOES 1 through 10, ) COUNTERCLAIMS [86]  
Defendants. )

---

Currently before the Court is Defendant Code Rebel, LLC's ("Code Rebel") Motion for Leave to File Counterclaims against Plaintiff Aqua Connect ("Plaintiff") [7]. The Court, having considered all papers, arguments submitted and heard pertaining to this Motion, **NOW FINDS AND RULES AS FOLLOWS:**

Code Rebel's Motion is **DENIED**.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff brings this Action against Defendants Code Rebel, Arben Kryeziu, and Volodymyr Bykov (collectively "Defendants"), alleging that Defendants

1 wrongfully reverse engineered Plaintiff's Aqua Connect  
2 Terminal Server ("ACTS") software and subsequently  
3 produced and distributed a competing software product,  
4 IRAPP TS, in violation of California law [77]. Code  
5 Rebel, who has already served its Answer in this case  
6 [31, 85], presently seeks leave of Court to file three  
7 libel-based and three antitrust-based counterclaims  
8 against Plaintiff as a result of information that Code  
9 Rebel allegedly learned during discovery [86]. For the  
10 reasons set forth below, the Court **DENIES** Defendant's  
11 Motion for Leave to File Counterclaims.

## 12 II. DISCUSSION

### 13 A. Legal Standard

14 A compulsory counterclaim is a counterclaim that  
15 must be filed in a pleading if the counterclaim arises  
16 out of the same transaction or occurrence as the  
17 opposing party's claim and does not require the  
18 addition of another party over which the court cannot  
19 acquire jurisdiction. Fed. R. Civ. P. 13(a). However,  
20 if a counterclaim matures after a pleading is filed, or  
21 if it is acquired by a party after serving an earlier  
22 pleading, the after-acquired counterclaim is  
23 technically not compulsory, and a party may supplement  
24 its pleading in order to assert such a "permissive"  
25 counterclaim as allowed by the court. See Fed. R. Civ.  
P. 13(e); 6 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1428 (3d ed.).  
In determining whether a party should be allowed to  
amend its pleadings pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil

1 Procedure 13, courts rely on the standard of Federal  
2 Rule of Civil Procedure 15 for granting leave to amend.  
3 F.D.I.C. v. Twin Dev., LLC, No. 10-CV-2279-BEN KSC,  
4 2012 WL 1831639 at \*6 (S.D. Cal. May 18, 2012); Healy  
5 v. DJO, LLC, No. 11CV673-IEG JMA, 2011 WL 5118748 at  
6 \*1-\*2 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2011).

7 Amendment of a pleading under Rule 15 is generally  
8 permitted in accordance with the Federal Rule's liberal  
9 pleading standard unless the opposing party makes a  
10 showing of bad faith, undue delay, prejudice by virtue  
11 of allowing the amendment, or futility of the  
12 amendment. See Foman v. Davis, 371 U.S. 178, 182  
13 (1962); Zucco Partners, LLC v. Digimarc Corp., 552 F.3d  
14 981, 1007 (9th Cir. 2009). Prejudice to the opposing  
15 party carries the greatest weight in determining  
16 whether to grant leave to amend. Eminence Capital, LLC  
17 v. Aspeon, Inc., 316 F.3d 1048, 1052 (9th Cir. 2003);  
18 Bowles v. Reade, 198 F.3d 752, 758 (9th Cir. 1999).  
19 "Absent prejudice, or a strong showing of any of the  
20 remaining Foman factors, there exists a *presumption*  
21 under Rule 15(a) in favor of granting leave to amend."  
22 Eminence Capital, 316 F.3d at 1052 (emphasis in  
23 original).

24 **B. Analysis**

25 Although Code Rebel is correct in stating that  
26 leave to amend should be freely given when justice so  
27 requires, Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2), "[i]t is within the  
28 court's discretion to deny leave to amend where the

1 proposed counterclaim presents a cause of action  
2 unrelated to the pending action." Hewlett-Packard Co.  
3 v. Repeat-O-Type Stencil Mfg., No. C-92-3330 DLJ, 1995  
4 WL 552168 at \*5 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 1995). Denial is  
5 particularly appropriate when seemingly unrelated  
6 counterclaims are proposed late in the litigation, for  
7 belated interjection of such claims may be "unduly  
8 disruptive" of the underlying Action. Harbor Ins. Co.  
9 v. Continental Bank Corp., 922 F.2d 357, 360-61 (7th  
10 Cir. 1990). See also 6 Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1428  
11 (3d ed.) ("[U]nrelated claims, particularly if they are  
12 asserted relatively late in the proceedings, may be  
13 more properly left to an independent suit.").

14 Here, Code Rebel offers two explanations for how  
15 its after-acquired counterclaims are sufficiently  
16 related to Plaintiff's claims so as to justify that  
17 they be tried together rather than in separate  
18 proceedings. First, Code Rebel contends that its  
19 counterclaims "concern[] Plaintiff's conduct during the  
20 marketing and selling of its [ACTS] computer program –  
21 the alleged reduced sales of which form the basis for  
22 Plaintiff's damages calculations in the [Second Amended  
23 Complaint]." Mot. 10:15-19. Second, Code Rebel  
24 asserts that Plaintiff's conduct, as alleged in the  
25 counterclaims, "reach[es] the level of unconscionable  
26 acts" that is necessary for Code Rebel to prevail on an  
27 affirmative defense of unclean hands, which Code Rebel  
28 has asserted in this case. Id. at 10:20-11:4.

1 However, neither of these explanations sufficiently tie  
2 Code Rebel's counterclaims to the pending Action for  
3 purposes of amending Code Rebel's pleading at this  
4 stage of litigation. Plaintiff's claims focus entirely  
5 on Defendants' alleged reverse engineering of ACTS,  
6 whereas Code Rebel's counterclaims address Plaintiff's  
7 alleged libelous representations to third parties and  
8 its sale of the ACTS program at prices below cost.  
9 Quintana Decl., Ex. A, 4:6-13. The alleged connection  
10 between Defendant's counterclaims and Plaintiff's  
11 Action is tenuous, at best, and is not sufficiently  
12 related to the underlying transactions and occurrences  
13 so as to justify the assertion of Code Rebel's  
14 counterclaims at this late stage of litigation, where  
15 discovery closed three months ago and the date for  
16 trial is only two months away. See Agar Corp., Inc. v.  
17 Multi-Fluids Inc., No. CIV. A. H-95-5105, 1998 WL  
18 425474 at \*4 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 17, 1998) (denying  
19 defendants leave to file after-acquired counterclaims  
20 because they were "not compulsory counterclaims and  
21 would be more appropriately asserted in an independent  
22 action, especially where adding these claims at this  
23 point in time would unnecessarily delay the trial"),  
24 aff'd sub nom. Agar Corp., Inc. v. Multi-Fluid, Inc.,  
25 215 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 1999); Magnesystems, Inc. v.  
26 Nikken, Inc., 933 F. Supp. 944, 952-53 (C.D. Cal. 1996)  
27 (denying defendants leave to file counterclaims under  
28 Fed. R. Civ. P. 13(e) because the counterclaims would

1 require new discovery, prolong litigation, "entirely  
2 change the focus of [the] case and, potentially,  
3 prejudice the Plaintiff"); All W. Pet Supply Co. v.  
4 Hill's Pet Prods. Div., Colgate-Palmolive Co., 152  
5 F.R.D. 202, 204-05 (D. Kan. 1993) ("[T]o permit [the  
6 defendant] to assert its supplemental counterclaim less  
7 than one month in advance of the date this case is set  
8 for trial will complicate trial preparation and will  
9 inevitably result in delay of trial. . . . While [the  
10 defendant] agrees to limit and expedite the discovery,  
11 the time spent on such discovery will prevent both  
12 parties from devoting the necessary time to adequately  
13 prepare to address the main issues in dispute in this  
14 case."). As the court noted in Samick Music  
15 Corporation v. Delaware Music Industries, Inc., "[t]he  
16 issues in the original complaint are nearing the trial  
17 stage and to interject issues . . . of a very different  
18 character at this stage would be prejudicial to the  
19 plaintiff." No. Civ. A. No. 91-23-CMW, 1992 WL 39052  
20 at \*7 (D. Del. 1992). Thus, the Court **DENIES** Code  
21 Rebel's Motion because the filing of Code Rebel's  
22 unrelated counterclaims this late in the litigation  
23 would be unduly prejudicial to Plaintiff. See Foman,  
24 371 U.S. at 182.

25       ///

26       ///

27       ///

28       ///

1                           **III. CONCLUSION**

2       Based on the foregoing, the Court **DENIES** Code  
3 Rebel's Motion for Leave to File Counterclaims.

4  
5       **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6       Dated: June 11, 2013.

7  
8                           RONALD S.W. LEW

9                           **HONORABLE RONALD S. W. LEW**

10                          U.S. District Court Judge

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28